FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM FRANCIS D. BLAIR.

Freedom, Fremont and Bissell Must Triumph.

The following facts will be found interesting and useful to speakers and others during the present canvass.

The all absorbing issue to be decided at the next election is, shall slavery become a national institution and be extended into all the territories of the Union, or shall it be confined to its present limits? On this subject the Republican party and its leaders in Illinois occupy precisely the same position that the framers of the Constitution, the founders of the Republic and the leaders of the Whig and Democratic parties, with the single exception of John C. Calhoun, occupied up to the time of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise in 1854. Hence both Whigs and Democrats should stand together and defend this principle. It is founded in the eternal principles of right and justice. Jefferson enunciated it in the Declaration of Independence, "All men are created equal"—it lies at the base of our political and social institutions—it is the foundation of our national prosperity and is as old as the government. Here is the proof:

WHIG AND DEMOCRATIC DOCTRINE ONCE.

The following is one of the famous Fairfax County Resolves, adopted at a public meeting held in Fairfax County, in Virginia, the 16th day of July, 1774, over which General Washington presided, reported by the committee of which he was chairman, and, by direction of the meeting, reported by him to the State Convention held the following August:

"*Resolved*, That it is the opinion of this meeting, that during our present difficulties and distress, no slaves ought to be imported into any of the British colonies on this continent; and we take this opportunity of declaring our most earnest wishes to see an entire stop forever put to such a wicked, cruel, and unnatural trade."

LETTER TO ROBERT MORRIS.

"I hope it will not be conceived from these observations, that is my wish to hold the unhappy people, who are the subject of this letter (negroes) in slavery. I can only say that *there is not a man living* who wishes more sincerely than I do to see a plan adopted for the *abolition* of it; but there is only one proper and effective mode by which it can be accomplished, and that is by legislative authority; and this, *so far as my suffrage will go, shall never be wanting.*"—*Spark's Writings of Washington. Vol.* 9, *p.* 158.

LETTER TO JOHN F. MERCER.

"I never mean, unless some particular circumstance should *compel* me to it, to possess another slave by purchase, it being *among my first wishes* to see some plan adopted by which *slavery in this country may be abolished by law.*"—*Same vol*, *p.* 159.

These letters were all written in 1786; the next year the Ordinance of 1787 was enacted, and the year following Gen. Washington was elected President of the United States unanimously.

"I agree with you cordially in your views regarding negro slavery. I have long considered it a most serious evil, both socially and politically, and I should rejoice in any feasible scheme to rid our States of such a burden. The Congress of 1787 adopted an ordinance which prohibits the extension of involuntary servitude in our Northwestern Territories *forever*. *I consider it a wise measure.* I hope we shall have a confederacy of free States."—*Washington to Lafayette*, 1797.

"I do not wish to see it recognized by the Constitution of the United States of America, *that there can be property in men.*—*Madison in the U. S. Constitutional Convention.*

"That after the year 1800 of the Christian era there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the said States, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been convicted to have been personally guilty.—*Jefferson's Ordinance*, 1784.

"We will go to the verge of the Constitution in order to rid our country of this curse."—*Ben. Franklin's Memorial to Congress.*

"If I could only be instrumental in ridding of the *foul blot* of slavery that revered State that gave me birth, or that no less beloved State which I now represent upon this floor, I would not exchange the honor for that of the most successful conqueror that ever lived.

"I never can, and never will, and no earthly power will ever make me vote to spread slavery where it does not exist."—*Henry Clay*, 1848.

"I frankly avow my unwillingness to do anything that shall extend the slavery of the African race over this continent or add other slaveholding States to the Union.—*Daniel Webster*, 1837.

"I should be false to all the opinions and principles of my life if I did not promptly return an emphatic no! when called upon to accord my sanction to a form of government which perpetuates slavery.—*Caleb Cushing*, 1826.

"*Resolved*, If the friends of liberty should wait for leave of tyrants to abolish tyranny, the day of free government would never dawn upon the oppressed millions of our race.—*Franklin Pierce*, 1848.

In accordance with these principles, the Missouri Compromise was passed in 1820, by which slavery was prohibited north of 36 deg., 30 min.; and Missouri was admitted as a slave State. The South were nearly unanimous for the measure, and a portion of the North objected to it for the reason that it *permitted* slavery to go south of that line. They insisted it should be prohibited *everywhere*.

Hear what Mr. Douglas himself says of that Compromise in his celebrated Springfield speech in 1849:

It (the Compromise) had become canonized in the hearts of the American people as a sacred thing, which no ruthless hand would ever be reckless enough to disturb."

In the session of Congress in 1853–4, Mr. Douglas made a report on a bill which proposed to repeal the Missouri act of 1820, in which he declared in explicit terms that the repeal of the Missouri Compromise would be a violation o the settling measures of 1850, and would open up again the great agitation which had been so happily settled by that measure. Here is a passage of this report.* He says:

"Your committee do not feel themselves called upon to enter into the discussion of these controverted quotations. They involve the same grave issues which produced the agitation, the sectional strife and fearful struggle of 1850. A Congress deemed it wise and prudent to refrain from deciding the matters in controversy then, either by affirming or repealing the Mexican laws, or by an act declaratory of the true intent of the Constitution, and to the extent of the protection afforded by it to slave property in the Territories; so your committee are not prepared now to recommend a departure from the course pursued on that memorable occasion, either by affirming or repealing the 8th section of the Missouri act, or by any act declaratory of the meaning of the Constitution in respect to the legal points in dispute."

That is the report of Mr. Douglas, made in January, 1854; and not made by by Mr. Douglas, of Illinois, alone; but made by him as chairman of a committee of Southern orig'n and Southern principles, to which had been referred the questions of the Territories of the United States in the Senate of the United States. It was received without a murmur by the entire Southern portion of the Senate of the United States.

And yet this compromise, so "sacred," so "canoniz d in the hearts of the American people as a sacred thing," Mr. Douglas and Mr. Pierce with "ruthless hand" did "disturb" and repeal. The object of that repeal was to open the way for slavery TO GO INTO KANSAS.

Then and Now.

Mr. Buchanan in his letter to Robert G. Scott, just before the meeting of the Baltimore Convention of 1852, wrote as follows of what were called the compromise measures:

"In what estimation would the civilized world hold the conduct of one of the parties to a solemn treaty of peace between independent nations, who, whilst himself in the benefit of all the enjoyments stipulated in his favor, and in which he knows he can never be disturbed, should he then turn round, and, merely because he possesses the power, deprive the other party of the only equivalent he had received under this very treaty?

"But I forbear to pursue this subject. In my opinion, the harmony of the States and the prosperity—it may be the preservation—of the Union depend upon the maintenance and faithful execution of all the compromise measures. *It is now too late in the day to go behind the record and discuss their original merits.*"

A "change" has come over Mr. Buchanan, as there did over Gen Cass in 1848; and we may add that a corresponding change has come over the people.

POSITION OF THE DOUGLAS-BUCHANAN PARTY.

That it is pledged to extend slavery is proved by its orators and recognized organs.

Speaking of the Cincinnati Platform the N. Y. *Day Book*, a recognized Buchanan journal, reciving its support from the Custom House, says:

"Shall the Democratie party fear this issue, to *oppose the extension of slavery?* No, indeed, a thousand times, a million times, No; THERE IS NOT A SINGLE DEMOCRAT IN THE WHOLE NORTH OPPOSED TO THE EXTENSION OF SOUTHERN SOCIETY, OR SO-CALLED EXTENSION OF "SLAVERY," and they only wait to have the truth spoken out and things called by their right names to sweep the abolition imposture from the Republic, and to bury its besotted fools in the profoundest depths—the lowest possible depths in the public contempt."

But the *Day Book* goes even further than this. Not content with extending negro slavery, it advocates the enslavement of poor white people. Alluding to the condition of the latter class, it utters the following language:

"Sell the parents of these children into SLAVERY. Let our Legislature pass a law that whosoever will take these parents and take care of them and their OFFSPRING, in sickness and in health—*clothe* them, *feed* them, and *house* them—*shall be legally entitled to their services;* and let the same legislature decree that whosoever receives these parents and their CHILDREN, and obtains their services, shall take care of them AS LONG AS THEY LIVE."

The National Democratic Committee at Washington has ordered thousands of copies of this scandalous journal for general distribution weekly throughout the country. They were scattered broadcast through Iowa previous to the election in that State, and they are now being extensively circulated in Illinois.

Thus speaks the Richmond *Enquirer:*

"It is in vain, it is folly longer to disguise the issue, it is *Slavery or no Slavery.*"

The Charleston *Evening News* says:

"The issue is *Slavery or no Slavery*, it is useless to disguise it."

The New York *Day Book* declares it to be the issue and says:

"Woe to those of the Democratic party who flinch from the contest."

3216
B59524

The Washington *Union*, declares it to be the issue of the day.

Thus speaks a Southern politician:

"We Southerners intend to make slavery national not sectional even at the cost of making a new southern nation, an independent slave nation of our own. All compromise must be abolished and slavery made national."

READ THIS.

The Richmond *Enquirer*, the leading Douglas and Buchanan organ at the South, holds the following language:

"Repeatedly have we asked the North, 'Has not the experiment of universal liberty failed? Are not the evils of free society insufferable? and do not most thinking men among us propose to *subvert* it?' Still no answer. The gloomy silence is another conclusive proof, added to many other conclusive evidences we have furnished, that *free society* in the *long run* is an impracticable form of society; it is everywhere starving, *demoralized* and *insurrectionary*. We repeat, then, that policy and humanity alike *forbid the extension* of the *evils of free society* to new people and coming generations. Two opposite and conflicting forms of society cannot, among civilized men, co-exist and endure. The one must give way and cease to exist—the other become universal. If *free society* be unnatural, immoral, unchristian, it must fall and give way to a *slave society—a system as old as the world, universal as man.*"

The Muscogee (Ala.) *Herald*. another Buchanan organ, says:

"Free society! we sicken of the name. What is it but the conglomeration of greasy mechanics, filthy operatives, small fisted farmers, and moon struck theorists? All the Northern and especially the New England States, are devoid of society fitted for well bred gentlemen. The prevailing class one meets is that of mechanics struggling to be genteel, and small farmers who do their own drudgery; and yet who are hardly fit for associating with a Southern gentleman's body servant. That is your free society which the Northern hordes are endeavoring to extend into Kansas."

NO MORE FREE STATES.

The Richmond *Enquirer* is also loudly proclaiming that *there shall be no more free States*. Here is the programme as laid down in a recent number of that paper:

"With Kansas to back them in the Senate, the South can compel the fulfillment of the stipulations of the Texas treaty, by RESISTING THE ADMISSION OF OTHER FREE STATES."

MR. BUCHANAN SOUND ON THE SLAVERY ISSUE—THE SECTIONAL CANDIDATE OF THE SOUTH.

The Charleston *Mercury*, a leading Southern Buchanan journal, says:

"We have, in former articles, reviewed Mr. Buchanan's career upon the tariff and internal improvements; and we now come to his course in reference to slavery. Upon this point we shall deal fully—and we invite the attention of our readers to the proofs, that Mr. Buchanan is, *in all respects, on this question, entitled to the support of the people of the South.* How any one acquainted with our political history for the past twenty years, and the course of public men during that period, *can now arraign Mr. Buchanan as unsound upon the question of slavery, we are wholly at a loss to conceive. Ignorance or misconception is the only solution.*

"But to the question—'Is Mr. Buchanan sound on slavery?' This is the question, above all others, to be answered satisfactorily. It would be enough to show that from the first day Mr. Buchanan came into Congress to the present time, *he had never given a vote, or uttered a word, hostile to the institution of slavery* or which could possibly give encouragement to abolitionism. *But we claim for him more than a mere negative friendship to the South. We assert that he has never failed to advocate her rights whenever they have been assailed.*"

The Richmond *Enquirer* makes the following truthful synopsis of Mr. Buchanan's qualifications as the candidate of the South:

"1. In 1836 Mr. Buchanan supported a bill to prohibit the circulation of abolition papers through the mail.

"2. In the same year he proposed and voted for the admission of Arkansas.

"3. In 1836–7, he denounced and voted to reject petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

"4. In 1837, he voted for Mr. Calhoun's famous resolution, defining the rights of the States and the limits of federal authority, and affirming it to be the duty of the government to protect and uphold the institution of the South.

"5. In 1838, '39 and '40 he invariably voted with Southern Senators against the consideration of anti-slavery petitions.

"6. In 1844–5, he advocated and voted for the annexation of Texas.

"7. In 1847, he sustained the Clayton Compromise.

"In 1850, he proposed and urged the the extension of the Missouri Compromise to the Pacific Ocean.

"9. But he promptly acquiesced in the Compromise of '50, and employed all his influence in favor of the faithful execution of the Fugitive Slave law.

"10. In 1854, he remonstrated against an enactment of the Pennsylvania Legislature for obstructing the arrest and return of fugitive slaves.

"11. In 1854, he negotiated for the acquisition of Cuba.

"12. In 1856, approves the repeal of the Missouri restriction, and supports the principle of the Kansas-Nebraska act.

"13. He never gave a vote against the interests of slavery, and never uttered a word which could pain the most sensitive Southern heart."

WHO ARE THE DISUNIONISTS.

The following extracts are selected from authentic records of opinion expressed by men, all of whom are now prominent supporters of Buchanan or Fillmore:

By Senator Yulee, of Florida—

"For my part I am ready to proceed to extreme measures, even to the dissolution of the Union."

By Senator Brown, of Mississippi—

"If the Wilmot Proviso is adopted, it will raise a storm that will sweep away this Union, and I pray God devoutly it will do so."

By Mr. Morse, of Louisiana—

"The southern man who will stand up and say that he is for the Union, 'now and forever,' is more dangerous to the people he represents than those who are in open hostility. If California be trammeled with a preamble declaring

the Territory now free, I am willing to dissolve the Union."

By Mr. Stanton, of Tennessee—

"When the Wilmot Proviso is adopted, I and the South are ready to walk out of the Union."

By Senator Butler, of South Carolina—

"I do not make the salvation of the Union the paramount question."

By Senator Mason, of Virginia—

"It is time the yoke was thrown off and the question settled."

By Mr. Colcock, of Georgia—

"If the Wilmot Proviso should pass in any form, I will introduce a bill for the dissolution of the Union."

By Mr. [illegible], of Virginia—

"[illegible] * * * [illegible] peaceably if we can, *forcibly if we must*."

By Mr. McWillie, of Mississippi—

"The people of the South know their rights, and will maintain them at all hazards, even should disunion result. * * * The South must defend their rights at the expense of blood."

The following resolution was adopted at a Congressional caucus of southern democrats, held in Washington in January 1849:

"*Resolved*, That the dissolution of the Union is preferable to the submission of the South to the Wilmot Proviso."

The following toasts were drank at a Democratic 4th of July celebration, at Atchison City, Kansas:

"DISUNION.—By secession or otherwise—a beacon of hope to an oppressed people, and the surest remedy for southern wrongs. [Enthusiastic cheers.]"

"The city of Atchison—May she, before the close of the year '57, be the capital of a Southern Republic. [Cheers.]"

The Hon. Preston S. Brooks, in a speech made in Columbia, S. C., on the 29th of August last, as reported in the *Carolina Times*, says:

"On the second Monday in November next the great question would be decided. For his part, if Fremont, the traitor to his section, should be successful, it was his deliberate opinion that on the fourth of March next the people of the South should rise in their might, march to Washington, and seize the archives and the Treasury of the Government. We should anticipate them, and force them to attack us."

Hear the Charleston *Mercury*, good authority with all Buchanan men, upon this subject:

"Upon the policy of dissolving the Union, or separating the South from her Northern enemies, and establishing a Southern Confederacy, parties, presses, politicians and people at the South are a unit. *There is not a single public man in her limits, not one of her present Representatives or Senators in Congress, who is not pledged to the lips in favor of disunion.* Indeed, we well remember that one of our most prominent leaders of the co-operation party, when taunted with submission, rebuked the thought by saying, 'that in opposing Secession he only took a step backwards to strike a blow more deadly against the Union."

In a recent letter declining an invitation to attend a barbacue at Baton Rouge, Senator Slidell of Louisiana says:

"I do not hesitate to declare that the Union cannot and ought not to be preserved."

KANSAS.

We have not room to enter fully into this subject. A bogus legislature was elected by armed Missouri ruffians, who took possession of the polls and drove away the Free State settlers at the peril of their lives. They enacted laws which Gen. Cass has pronounced "a disgrace to humanity and to the age in which we live." Here is a specimen of these laws, denying the liberty of speech and of the press:

"If any free person, by speaking or by writing, [illegible] persons have not the right to hold slaves in this Territory, print, publish, write, circulate, or cause to be introduced into this Territory, written, printed, published or circulated in this Territory, any book, paper, pamphlet, magazine or circular containing any denial of the rights of persons to hold slaves in this Territory, such person shall be deemed guilty of felony and punished by imprisonment at hard labor for a term of not less than two years."

Another article for similar offences, enacts that a ball and chain shall be fastened around the ancles of offenders and they shall be made to work on the public highways. The Free State Hotel was burned by an armed mob; printing presses have been thrown into the Missouri and Kansas Rivers; murders and arsons, and every species of crime have been committed in that devoted Territory, and yet all these outrages have been virtually indorsed by the administration at Washington.

Only a few weeks ago a large force from Missouri invaded Kansas. The purpose of this invasion is very decidedly expressed in the following extract from a letter published in the Richmond (Va.) *Whig*, dated Kansas City, August 19:

"We will go in this time with a force sufficient to clean out Kansas, you may rely on that; and this attack will make Kansas a slave State beyond all doubt. Let me assure you that Missourians will never go into Kansas again without driving out the last scoundrel. Before eight days have elapsed, Missouri will send in five thousand 'border ruffians,' and they will never leave as long as there is an abolitionist in that beautiful Territory. They have been there twice, and the third time will tell the tale. Nothing is surer now than that Kansas will be a slave State."

Freemen in Kansas have nothing to expect from Mr. Buchanan. Under the administration of Mr. Pierce they have suffered the most terrible wrongs recorded in our history. The Cincinnati Convention thus indorses his administration:

Resolved, That the administration of Franklin Pierce has been true to Democratic principles, and therefore true to the great interests of the country: in the face of the violent opposition, he has maintained the laws at home, and

therefore we proclaim ☞ OUR UNQUALIFIED APPROBATION OF HIS MEASURES AND POLICY.

Here the administration of Mr. Pierce, with all the fearful wrongs he has caused to poor bleeding Kansas, is fully indorsed. The report of the Congressional Committee on Kansas Affairs establishes all these charges.

THE REPUBLIC TO BE SOLD OUT TO GREAT BRITAIN.

Hear the Richmond *Enquirer* on this subject:

"We are heartily sick and disgusted with the canting and mercenary hypocrites of Yankeedom. This Kansas war will enable us to get rid of them, or turn the tables upon them, and render them a source of progt instead of expense. It will enable us to regain our own—pilfered from us by many a sharp transaction. It will enable us to build up our country by the recapture of the millions of which we have been plundered. It will enable us to get rid of the Yankee Presidents, and to preserve Anglo-Saxon freedom by reviving the old connection with the *mother country*. (Who would not rather be ruled over by a *lady* like Queen Victoria, than any nasal-twanged *gentleman* the Yankee land can produce?) It will enable us, with the United States *South*, on one side, in the close alliance with England and Canada on the other, very speedily to bring those long-prayered sharpers to their senses, by confining them to the starving soil on which they were born, and to the thin air around them."

FREMONT AND BUCHANAN—THE CONTRAST.

Free labor—the natural capital which constitutes the real wealth of this great country, and creates that intelligent power in the masses alone to be relied on as the bulwark of free institutions.—*John C. Fremont's Letter of Acceptance.*

Reduce our nominal to the real standard of prices throughout the world, and you cover our country with blessings and benefits.—*See Buchanan's Speech on Low Wages, Niles' Register, vol. 7, p. 426.*

At the time this sentiment was uttered "the real standard of prices throughout the world" for labor per day was about ten cents. Hence the name of "TEN CENT JIMMY!" Don't he deserve it?

MR. BUCHANAN A FILLIBUSTER.

Here is the Ostend Manifesto, with the signatures of American Ministers—Soulé, Minister to Spain, Mason, to France, and *Buchanan*, to England—and laid before the Spanish Government at Madrid.

This *honorable and conservative trio*, after arguing the case to show that the Spanish Government ought to sell Cuba to the United States, proceed in this wise:

"After we shall have offered Spain a price for Cuba far beyond its present value, and this shall have been refused, it will then be time to consider the question—does Cuba, in the possession of Spain, seriously endanger our internal peace and the existence of our cherished Union? Should this question be answered in the affirmative, then by every law, human and divine, we shall be justified in wresting it from Spain if we possess the power."

The Filliusters know their man. *La Verdad*, the Spanish newspaper published by the Cuban Fillibusters in New York, goes in strong for Buchanan, as just the man who will carry out its views, *i. e.*, pick a quarrel with Spain for the purpose of getting Cuba and its slaves. It says:

"We sincerely desire that he (Buchanan) and no other may be chosen to guide the high destinies of this great nation. If, as may happen, the affairs of Mexico and Spain become complicated, no President can serve *us* (*i. e.*, the Fillibusters) so well as the champion of the Democracy, *whose opinions respecting Cuba are known to our readers.* Consequently we are for Buchanan."

Hear also another witness:

Hon. Lawrence M. Keitt of South Carolina is a good Democrat and a good friend of Mr. Buchanan, is he not? He is a fair representative of his party, is he not? Well, let us see what he has to say on the subject of fillibusterism, as the legitimate corollary of the Ostend Manifesto. While recruiting his exhausted energies at the White Sulphur Springs, expended in defending his colleague Bully Brooks, he received an invitation to give an exposition of democratic principles at Lynchburg, Va., and there on the evening of the 10th inst. he made an elaborate speech, in which the following passage occurs:

"I go with the Democratic party for the present, because it is the best party. [Cheers.] If that party deviates from the right line of policy, I will oppose it. [Cheers.] I say never will I act with any party that does not stand upon the Constitution—I mean for the rights of the South. [Loud Cheers.] I go with it now because it is a gallant party—because it is a progressive party—because it is a conservative party. [Cheers.] We have before us a great country. We have two races, the Latin and the Anglo-Saxon, and with such elements composing the population of our country our destiny must be a noble and exalted one. They love progress, and the first step in that direction is the acquisition of Cuba. [Loud and enthusiastic cheers.] Standing on your Southern shores, the sentinel on our watchtowers, it must be ours, or the South is exposed to invasion. Yes, it must be ours, and I have no objection to the filibusters taking it. [Loud cheers.] Take it, and we will pay for it afterwards. [Tremendous cheers.] Take it—I care not in what manner—and then we will roll into it a Gulf Stream of Southern population that will make it truly the gem of the Antilles. Extensively guarded, by nature protected, roll into it your Southern population, and the navies of all the earth may thunder around its shores and they will thunder in vain. [Loud cheers.] Yes, controlling the commerce of the West for three thousand miles, and controlling also the commerce of the East, through the greater enterprise and commercial spirit of our population, Cuba would be what Palmyra was in ancient times, if it once throws off the despotism of Spanish rule. [Loud cheers.] *The Democratic party can and will take it.* [Cheers.] The destiny of that party is indeed a noble destiny."

IMPORTANT POLITICAL STATISTICS.

Of the 6,622,418 white inhabitants of the South only 347,525 are owners of slaves, yet this faction controls every branch of the Federal Gov-

ernment, and wields its influence for the increase and perpetuation of slavery. Annexed is a classification of the slaveholders in 1850:

Holders of	1 slave			68,820
" "	1 and under	5		105 683
" "	5 "	"	10	80,763
" "	10 "	"	20	54 765
" "	20 "	"	50	29,733
" "	50 "	"	100	6 196
" "	100 "	"	200	1,479
" "	200 "	"	300	187
" "	300 "	"	500	56
" "	500 "	"	1000	9
" "	1000 "	over		2
Total number of slaveholders				347,525

The Congressional representation of the Free and Slave States is as follows:

HOUSE OF REP.

The Free States have a total of 144 members.

The Slave States have a total of 90 members.

One Free State Representative represents 91,935 white men and women.

One Slave State Representative represents 56,725 white men and women.

Slave Representation gives to Slavery an advantage over Freedom of 21 votes in the House of Representatives.

U. S. SENATE.

Sixteen Free States with a white population of 18,288,670 have 32 Senators.

Fifteen Slave States, with a population of 6,185,477 have 30 Senators.

So that 413,703 Free men of the North enjoy but the same political privileges in the United States Senate that are given to 206,215 Slave Propagandists.

The Post Office statistics for a single year ar interesting, exhibiting as they do the advantages derived in this department of governmental economy by the South at the expense of the North. We annex a brief statement:

Chief Items of Account.	Free States.	Slave States.
Amount rec'd for Postage,	$4,891,300.80	$1 486,984 86
Paid for transp'n of Mails,	2,881,607.19	2 087,265 05
	$2,010,253.64	$600,281.99

The above shows that there is received yearly in the free States, two millions of dollars ($2,000,000) *more than is expended*, while in the slave States the *expenditures exceed the receipts* over six hundred thousand dollars, ($600,000.) With all its boasted wealth and chivalry, the South does not pay its own postage. And the majority, by which she usually carries her obnoxious measures, is composed of the TWENTY-ONE members she has in the House to represent her negroes. This was specially so in the case of the Kansas-Nebraska bill.

SLAVERY IN THE STATES.

The Republican party does not propose to interfere in any way with slavery where it now exists. It recognizes to the fullest extent the exclusive right of the slaveholding States to regulate the institution within their respective limits. It does not propose, in fact, to abolish or in any way interfere with slavery any where; but it simply opposes its extension into territories heretofore solemnly dedicated to freedom by the joint action of the slaveholding and free States. Examine the Republican platform below and see if this is not so. Away then with the infamous charge of Abolitionism and the unscrupulous demagogues who make it.

MR. BUCHANAN'S OPINION OF COL. FREMONT.

A recent steamer from England brought an important document, in which two of the candidates now before the people for the Presidency prominently figure. It is a certified copy of the evidence for the defence in the case of Gibbs vs. Frement, being the copy of depositions taken before the Commissioners under the authority of the Court of Common Pleas, London, in 1852. It will be remembered that Col. Fremont was arrested in London on account of debts contracted in California. The defence was, that these debts were contracted on account of the United States Government. Col. Fremont drew bills of exchange to the amount of nineteen thousand five hundred dollars upon the Secretary of State of the United States, the liabilities having been incurred on Government account while Col, Fremont was Governor of California. The bills fell into the hands of persons in London, and being protested for non-acceptance, the holders sought to hold Col. Fremont personally responsible. The evidence of James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania—upon whom, as Secretary of State, the bills were drawn—being considered material to the issue, the Court appointed Henry L. Gilpin, Hugh Campbell and Peter McCall, of Philadelphia, Commissioners to take depositions of witnesses for Col. Fremont in Pennsylvania. They were to be sworn and then adm inister oaths to interpreters, clerks, &c.—the testimony so taken to be sent to Sir James Parks, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas.

We have this testimony now before us in full, but, from its length, must content ourselves with giving its more material portions.

First, as to the credit which properly belongs to Col. Fremont as the "Conqueror of California." On this point Mr. Buchanan testified under oath at follows:

"Col. Fremont, the defendant, was in California at the commencement of hostilities between the United States and the Republic of Mexico; he there raised and commanded a battalion of California Volunteers, consisting of about four hundred men; his services were very valuable; he bore a conspicuous part in the conquest of California, and, in my opinion, is better entitled to be called the 'Conqueror of California' than any other man."

Then, as to the alleged speculations of Col. Fremont, here is what Mr. Buchanan deposes to:

"I do know that such supplies were necessary for the forces under the command of the defendant, and that no appropriation had been made by Congress to pay for the supplies. Congress could not have anticipated that Col. Fremont would raise a California battallion by his own personal exertions and without previous instructions."

So great indeed was Mr. Buchanan's confidence in Col. Fremont, that he declares, still under oath:

"I should have accepted and paid these bills, from my general knowledge of the transactions in California, had Congress appropriated any money and placed it at my disposal, which could be applied to their payment, though it would have been more correct to have drawn these bills on the Secretary of War."

FALSE ISSUES.

Mr. Douglas in his recent Springfield speech says:

"The [the Republican] party *has no constitutional principle to stand upon.* It does not pretend to have any. It stands only on the ground of individual opinion and Northern prejudice against constitutional rights which the wisest patriots of the earlier days of our history secured to the South. And in obedience to these prejudices they demand, upon pain of the dissolution of the Union. and the establishment of a Northern Republic—1. The repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law; 2. The abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia; 3. The abolition of the slave trade in the States; 4. No more slave States; 5. No territory to be acquired unless to be free forever. They have no other principles; their presses, their preachers, their public speakers tell of no other. How can a party thus constituted hope to preserve and perpetuate the Union? These demands strike at the existence of the Constitution—of the Union itself—the very instrument without which the States fall assunder and the Union is destroyed."

Every one of these five specifications is untrue. In proof of this read the

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Adopted at Philadelphia June 18th, 1856.

WHEREAS, This Convention of delegates, assembled in pursuance of a call addressed to the people of the United States without regard to past political differences or divisions, who are opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, to the policy of the present Administration, to the extension of slavery in Kansas, and in favor of the admission of Kansas as a free State: for restoring the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson, and for the purpose of presenting candidates for the offices of President and Vice President—

Resolved, That maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution is essential to the preservation of our Republican institutions; that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and that the Union of the States shall be preserved.

Resolved, That with our republican fathers we held it to be a self-evident truth, that all men are endowed with the inalienable right of liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that the primary object and ulterior design of our Federal Government was to secure such rights to all persons within its exclusive jurisdiction; that as our republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in our national territory, ordained that no person should be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, it becomes our duty to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it for the purpose of establishing slavery in the United States by positive legislation, and prohibiting its extension therein; that we deny the authority of Congress, of a territorial legislature, or of any individual or association, to give legal assistance to slavery in any territory of the United States, while the present constitution shall be maintained,

Resolved, That the Constitution confers on Congress sovereign power over the territories of the U. S., for their government and the exercise of their power: it is both the right and duty of Congress to prohibit in the territories polygamy and slavery.

Resolved, That while the Constitution of the United States was ordained and established in order to establish a more perfect union, secure justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence and secure the blessings of liberty and contains ample provisions for the protection of life, liberty, and property of every citizen, the dearest Constitutional rights of the people of Kansas have been fraudulently and violently taken from them, their Territory has been invaded by an armed force, spurious and pretended judicial and executive officials have been set over them, by whose usurped authority, sustained by the military power of government, tyrannical and unconstitutional laws have been enacted and enforced; the rights of the people to keep and bear arms have been grossly infringed; test oaths of an extraordinary and entangling nature have been imposed as a condition of exercising the right of suffrage, and holding offices; the right of an accused person to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury, has been denied; the right of the people to be secure in their houses, papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures has been violated; they have been deprived of life, liberty and property without due process of law; the freedom of speech and the press has been abridged, the right to choose their representatives has been made of no effect; murders, robberies and arson have been instigated and encouraged, and the offenders have been allowed to go unpunished; yet all these things have been done with the knowledge and sanction and procurement of the present administration—and that for this high crime against the Constitution, the Union and humanity, we arraign the administration, the President, his advisers, agents, supporters, apologists and accessories, either before or after the facts, before the country and before the world, and that it is our fixed purpose to bring the actual perpetrators of the atrocious outrages, and their accomplices, to a sure and condign punishment hereafter.

Resolved, That Kansas shall be admitted as a State of the Union with her present free constitution, as at once the most effectual way of securing to her citizens the enjoyment of the rights and privileges to which they are ent tied, and of ending the civil strife now raging in her territory,

Resolved, That the highwayman's plea that might makes right, embodied in the Ostend Circular, was in every respect unworthy of American diplomacy, and would bring shame and dishonor upon any government or people that gave it their sanction.

Resolved, That a railroad to the Pacific Ocean by the more central and practicable route is imperatively demanded by the interests of the whole country, and that the Federal Government ought to render immediate and efficient aid in its construction, and as an auxiliary thereto the immediate construction of an emigrant route on the line of the railroad,

Resolved, That appropriations by Congress for the improvement of rivers and harbors of a national character, required for the accomodation and security of our existing commerce, are authorized by the Constitution, and justified by the obligation of Government to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

Resolved, That we invite the affiliation and co-operation of the men of all parties, however different from us in other respects, in support of the principles herein declared; and believing that the spirit of our institutions as well as the Constitution of our country, guarantees liberty of conscience and equality of rights among the citizens, we oppose all legislation impairing their security,

Such, fellow-citizens, is the Republican platform, on which stands the pathfinder of empire, who planted the glorious stars and stripes on the highest peak of the Rocky Mountains. On the fourth of March next the people mean to place him in the Presidential chair, the highest and most responsible position that can be occupied by man. He is most worthy of that position.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM FRANCIS P. BLAIR

Cordial Union between Northern Democrats and Southern Nullifiers and Secessionists.

From the N. Y. Evening Post.

TO MY NEIGHBORS:

We have been highly honored of late by the dignitaries of Washington City—the office-holders and their satellites. Political meetings to instruct or gather the sense of our county, have been heretofore held in its central villages—in Rockville, Brookville, Poolesville, Colesville, and other points most convenient for such purposes. Are we not, then, under lasting obligations to the chief magistrate of the city of Washington (the Mayor), to the city Postmaster, to the editor of the most special organ of the President's man-of-all-work in the Cabinet, to an ex-member of Congress from the North, who, having lost his position with his constituents in the cause of the administration, is willing to serve it in any capacity that promises future promotion—are we not deeply indebted to such functionaries and their followers, for having deigned to call the county to its line at Silver Spring, and there treat it with so many good things provided for it in the city—not merely good things appealing to the appetites, but good sayings uttered, and signs exhibited, directing us in our duties? Not being one of

the invited, I can only return my thanks for the insignia with which they were so good as to adorn the confines of my farm, placing it in the eye of my dwelling, and for the personal honor done me in holding my course as a private citizen of such import as to merit animadversion. For one portion of the lofty decoration which floats over the scene of my humble employment, I am really grateful. It is the Flag of the Union, brought, I am told, from the Navy Yard of the metropolis. It may have displayed its constellation of stars at the mast-head of some noble seventy-four, and shed its glory over the great deep, where the proudest triumphs of our flag have been achieved. It now spreads its folds to the inland breeze from a hickory a hundred feet high! If its flag-staff had been elevated upon the summit of this noble tree as it grew and flourished with all its leafy honors, on its *free mount* that overlooks the headlong fall of the Anacostia, it would have been a fit emblem to awaken recollections of the illustrious chief with whose glory its name is associated. But it was cut down at the instance of the city officials——its branches lopped and dragged from its wild and airy height along the dusky thoroughfares—hoisted by ropes on the highway—and crowned with the skull and horns of an old Buck! There the imagination associates it with the idea of a death's head and gibbet.

OLD BUCK GIBBETED.

What an emblem to be exalted above the flag of the country and on the hickory tree which has given its name to one of its greatest heroes! Of all animals the deer is the most timid, and although the head of the buck is, at one season of the year, armed with a multitude of points as sharp as spears, it never confronts an enemy that it can escape with flying feet. The grand antlers are the mere emblem of warlike prowess, and evidence only of that species of gallantry that distinguishes the stag, and gives to a class of gentry of our species the name of bucks, young or old.

The old buck is a sort of old bachelor, like his fellow of the woods, addicted to no mate, and whose insignia of horns have, time out of mind, been held to characterize his pursuits. Is this an ensign to be exalted above that of the country and chosen to exemplify the virtues of one who aspires to the Chief Magistracy? If the crowning virtue be attributed to the coronet which distinguishes the old buck's head, and which now takes the place of the liberty cap on Democratic banners, it should be remembered that it is a virtue that comes and goes with the seasons. An old buck's honors begin to bud and grow in the balmy spring time—they are in the velvet in June, and throughout the summer. This smooth covering is slipped off in October. In November their vitality is blighted, and in March the crown of weather-beaten antlers drop from the old buck's brow, and he hides, droops in solitude, abandoned by all his fellows. The hunters of the Alleganies and of our frontiers will apply this piece of natural history, and interpret its augury.

A STORM BREWING AT THE SOUTH AGAINST THE TRAITORS.

The occasion of raising this trophy to Mr. Buchanan was taken to denounce me to my neighbors as "an *arch traitor!*" and "*a flash of lightning was invoked to bring down the justice of Heaven on my head!*" These men, who uphold the legislation which has lighted the torch of civil war in our land, and made violence and bloodshed the order of the day, seem to think they have only to point their finger at a victim in this quarter to make him a sacrifice. They know little of the deep-seated feeling which broods in silence in the South, and which will, ere long, overwhelm them with reprobation. Freedom of opinion, freedom of speech, freedom in every good sense which endeared it to the hearts of Americans when struggling for it against a foreign foe, is still held precious among the masses in the South as well as at the North; and the arrogant calumniators who came from the city to assail me for the views I have deemed it my duty to promulgate, found it so. The orator who undertook to point the indignation of the community in which I live against me, for the honest, disinterested opinions I have avowed, found his attempt promptly repelled by a neighbor, who flung back his accusation by a direct contradiction; and I am grateful to learn that the speech of my defender (who opposes the party to which I belong,) had the approval of the throng to whose prejudices the attack was meant as an appeal.

I owe it to my countrymen who so generously resented misrepresentations against an absent man, and which, under the sectional aspect now given to the political controversy, could hardly fail to provoke hostility against me, to lay before them my thoughts on public affairs, that they may calmly decide how much I am their enemy.

THE SCHEME OF THE NULLIFIERS.

I do not believe that the motives which led Messrs. Atchison, Butler, Mason and Hunter (the rump of the body of Nullifiers left by Mr. Calhoun in the Senate of the United States, and who still labor to effect his plan,) are well understood. The deeply plotted, thoroughly organized scheme to repeal the Missouri Compromise, which they were enabled to carry by promises, securing the help of Presidential aspirants in the North was not fully comprehend by them, or their party of doughfaces seduced by the patronage the balance of power vote of the South was to give them. It was not merely to acquire an additional slave State that the contract was violated which gave Missouri to the slaveholders and reserved Kansas for free labor. The great project of the Nullifiers, of which the repeal was the first step, as now revealed, evidently reaches to extend the slave line with the parallel bounding Kansas on the north to the Pacific, and to include all south of that line belonging to this continent, including Cuba, in a a slave empire.

The Cincinnati resolutions expressly assert a right to "*ascendancy*," to "*preponderance*," to "*control*," and not only over the land but the seas of this region. The resolutions which were prompted and sustained by the vote of the whole South and to which its acknowledged candidate pledged himself as swallowing up his individuality and rendering him a mere *machine* for their effectuation, did not mean that this vast conquest, from which slavery is now banished, should be banished to our Union as the nursery of *free* States. A portion of the slaveholding class, now predominant over the party which issued this manifesto, hold that the existence of free States surrounding their peculiar institutions in a common confederacy, must be fatal to it. They hold that the contract of such kindred States as part of the same system, must gradually operate upon the interests, opinions, and finally upon the passions, of the whole class without slave States, so as to make legislation necessary to relieve it from the oppression, the inevitable result of the superincumbent weight of the slave power, in the hands of masters who

engross the soil and the entire political sovereignty, and who must in time become more absolute than any other prerogatived class on earth, because it is wholly independent of the white race to cultivate the soil which they engross. The forecast of this intellectual and educated class who wield all the State government in the South and who are animated by one commanding interest, producing thorough concert, sees, in course of time, that there must be an alienation between the patrons of slave labor, who derive support and power from it, and that portion of the white race among them who are struggling for subsistence, and who find a competition in slave labor which deprives them of employment on the estates of slaveholders and of ownership in the soil on which they might labor for themselves. The prerogative class in the South are resolved to cut the connection between the free laborer of the North and the free laborer in the slave States. It is looked to as an alliance which may at some time come to the rescue and save the white working man from the absolute dominion of the masters of the slaves and the soil.

J. H. Taylor, of Charleston, South Carolina, pursues this topic of the destitution of the mass of whites in that State, and points to the dangers to be apprehended from it. We take this passage from it in DeBow's Review, the editor of which is distinguished for his full information of the state of the South:

"So long as these poor but industrious people could see no mode of living except by a degrading operation of work with the negro upon the plantation, they were content to endure life in its most discouraging forms, satisfied they were *above* the slave, though faring often worse than he. But the progress of the world is 'onward,' and though in some sections it is slow, still it is '*onward*,' and the great mass of our poor white population begin to understand that they have rights, and that they, too, are entitled to some of the sympathy which falls upon the suffering. They are fast learning that there is an almost infinite world of industry opening before them, by which they can elevate themselves and their families from wretchedness and ignorance, to competence and intelligence. *It is this great upheaving of our masses that we have to fear, so far as our institutions are concerned.*"

WHITE MEN TO BE REDUCED TO SLAVERY.

These paragraphs are only scraps from volumes of evidence borne by the ablest men of the South, which prove that slave labor under the direction of the rich, educated and powerful class, has reduced the laboring white population to straits that make it "*an evil of great magnitude*," only to be cured by "*a change of public sentiment.*" Now I turn to that "*change* of public sentiment" as exhibited in the leading organs of the South—the Richmond *Enquirer* and Richmond *Examiner*—to show what remedy they propose for the oppression which weighs down the white laborer, who, without land of his own, is obliged to enter into competition with slave-labor, directed by an educated master with slaves and capital and unlimited power to command. The following passages are from late editorials in the presses which speak for the nullifiers of Virginia. They appeared during the last session of Congress, to instruct it in the new theory. This is from the Richmond *Enquirer*:

"Until recently, the defence of slavery has labored under great difficulties, because its apologists, for they were merely apologists, took half-way ground. They confined the defence of slavery to *mere negro slavery*, thereby giving up the slavery principle, admitting other forms of slavery to be wrong and yielding up the authority of the Bible, and of the history, practices, and experience of mankind. Human experience showing the universal success of slave society, and the universal failure of free society, was unavailing to them, because they were precluded from employing it, by admitting slavery in the abstract to be wrong. The defence of mere negro slavery involved them in still greater difficulty. The laws of all the Southern States justified the holding white men in slavery, provided that through the mother they were descended, however remotely, from a negro slave. The bright mulattoes, according to their theory, were wrongfully held in slavery.

"The line of defence, however, is changed now, and the North is completed cornered, and dumb as an oyster. The South now maintains that slavery is right, natural, and necessary. It shows that all divine and almost all human authority justifies it. The South further charges, that the little experiment of free society in Western Europe has been, from the beginning, a cruel failure, and that symptoms of failure are abundant in our North. While it is far more obvious that negroes be slaves than whites—for they are only fit to labor, not to direct—yet the principle of slavery is in itself right, and does not depend on difference of complexion. Difference of race, of lineage, of language, of habits and customs, all tend to render the institution more natural and durable; and although slaves have been generally white, still the masters and slaves have generally been of different national descent. Moses and Aristotle, the earliest historians, are both authorities in favor of the difference in race, but not of color."

THE BEAUTIES AND BLESSINGS OF SLAVERY.

A book has been published entitled "Free Society a Failure," written by George Fitzhugh, which the *Enquirer* and *Examiner* commend as supporting "the changes of sentiment," which they urge on in Virginia. This book gives emphasis to the new doctrines in these sentences:

"Make the laboring man the slave of one man, instead of the slave of society, and he would be far better off." "Two hundred years of liberty have made white laborers a pauper banditti. Free Society has failed, and that which is not free must be substituted."

"Say the abolitionists, 'Man ought not to have property in man.' What a dreary, cold, bleak, inhospitable world this would be, with such doctrine carried into practice!" * * * "Slavery has been too universal not to be necessary to nature, and no man struggles in vain against nature," * * * "Free society is a failure. We slaveholders say, you must recur to domestic slavery, the oldest, the best, and most common form of socialism."

"Free society is a monstrous abortion, and slavery the healthy, beautiful, and natural being which they are trying unconsciously to adopt." "The slaves are governed far better than the free laborers at the North are governed. Our negroes are not only better off as to physical comfort than free laborers, but their moral condition is better."

"We do not adopt the theory that Ham was the ancestor of the negro race. The Jewish slaves were not negroes; and to confine the justification of slavery to that race, would be to weaken its scriptural authority, and to lose the whole weight of profane authority—for we read of no negro slavery in ancient times." * *

"Slavery, black or white, is right and necessary."

"Nature has made the weak in mind or body slaves." * * * "The wise and virtuous, the brave, the strong in mind and body, are born to command."

"Men are not born entitled to equal rights. It would be far nearer the truth to say that 'some were born with saddles on their backs, and others booted and spurred to ride them—and the riding does them good.' 'They need the reins, the bit, and the spur.' 'Life and Liberty are not inalienable.' The Declaration of Independence is exuberantly false, and aborescently fallacious."

The Richmond *Examiner* supports the same views in this paragraph:

"At first view it seems strange that abolition never arose till after the institution of negro slavery. Protection to the weak, and subsistence for the ignorant, improvident and vicious, are the two great and most obvious considerations that render domestic slavery necessary. Neither private nor public charity is always at hand to relieve the wants, the sufferings, the sickness, and the many other misfortunes to which large masses of mankind, without property or property-holding connections, are subject.

"Our object in these preliminary remarks, is to show how unwise it is for the south to attempt to justify *negro* slavery as an *exceptional institution*. It is the only form of slavery which has excited the prejudices of mankind and given rise to abolition; the only kind of slavery which has not been until recently universal. The experience, the practices and the history of mankind amply vindicate slavery in the abstract as a natural, universal and conservative institution. In justifying slavery in the general or abstract we have to contend with the prejudices growing out of the African slave trade, out of the cruel treatment of slaves where ever that trade exists, and the still greater prejudices of race and color. Still, it is shown by history, both sacred and profane, that domestic slavery is a natural, normal, and, till lately, universal institution. A comparison of the evils of free and slave society, from the censuses of different countries, from the history of the

English Poor Laws, from the famines, revolutions infidelities, superstitions, agrarianisms and anarchies, that have of late years afflicted Western Europe, and from the communistic and socialistic movements of the day, proves those societies only to be permanent and enduring which have rested upon the patriarchal institution of domestic slavery as a basis. When it is thus shown that some kind of slavery is necessary, all must be willing to admit that, as slaves there must be, negroes are best fitted for that condition."

HEADQUARTERS OF THE OLIGARCHY—SCHEMES FOR A DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.

Charleston, South Carolina, is the headquarters of the oligarchy which originated the design of dissolving the Union, to bring under its subjection the laborer of the white race as well as of the black race. The power seated in Charleston is as absolute in South Carolina as that of Paris in France, and it aims to extend over the whole South, of which it aspires to become the metropolis, the same commanding influence. From this point every movement for the severence of the Union has received its impulse; and now, while in States around her this schemes is disguised, the first symtom of which was the breach of the Missouri Compromise, it is boldly avowed in Charleston *that the separation of the States is the great object, whatever may be the fate of the struggle for Kansas.* In a late article, the New York *Herald* replied to the threats of dissolution of the Union fulminated from the Charleston press, and said they were empty threats like those made in 1850, when California was admitted as a free State—that South Carolina, which then gave up the design on the pretence of waiting the co-operation of the other slave States, would succumb to the Union party and retract again on the same pretext. To this the leading organ of authority in the State of South Carolina, the Charleston *Mercury*, responds.

"The *Herald* does not know—what is, nevertheless, the fact—that, in that controversy, both parties advocated disunion. They differed only as to the mode—one being for disunion by state action, the other by co operation as it was termed or the joint action of several States. *But upon the policy of dissolving the Union, of separting the South from her Northern enemies and establishing a Southern confederacy, parties, presses, politicians and people were a a unit. There is not a single public man in her limits, not one of her present representatives or Senators in Congress, who is not pledged to the hips in favor of disunion.* Indeed, we well remember that one of the most prominent leaders of the co-operation party, when taunted with submission, rebuked the thought by saying, '*in opposing secession he only took a step backward to strike a blow more deadly against the Union.*' We saw him take 'the step backward,' but have waited in vain for the 'blow.' So much for the facts upon which the *Herald* bases its calculation as to slaveowners and non-slaveowners, the poor and the rich in South Carolina, in favor of the Union"

This is a declaration of the settled purpose of the State of South Carolina to dissolve the Union, dating with 1850 and only postponed for the co-operation of adjoining States. It is not made dependent on the result of the contest in Kansas. The separation of "*the South from her northern enemies*" is denounced simply because the people of the North are held to be enemies.

The retrocession from secession in 1850, was "*a step backward to strike a blow more deadly against the Union.*" It will be a more deadly blow, if the territories of the Union from the northern line of Kansas to the Gulf and Pacific, are first conquered and devoted to slavery. I do not believe that the purpose taken by the nullifying party in South Carolina, which speaks through the *Mercury*, is harbored by a majority of the slaveholders of the South, much less by a majority of the people, but that it is the long meditated scheme of the ambitious malcontents of South Carolina, who look with the eye of Cortez to the conquest of Mexico and Cuba, and the appropriation of their riches and the subjection of their people: the declarations quoted leave no doubt.

WHAT THE SLAVEHOLDERS AND THEIR ALLIES STRIKE FOR.

The issue now pending will decide whether the class bent on this career of conquest, shall have a starting point in the free territories of the Northwest, which will preclude all interference with the policy on the part of the free States. The belt which Kansas will give the slave class across the continent, embracing the whole genial region, is all they could ask from the North. This gained, the partition line dividing the Union would soon be announced, to get rid of northern intervention, and then the southern conquerors would turn their arms towards Mexico.

THE "POOR WHITES" IN THE SLAVE STATES—BEGINNING TO UNDERSTAND THEIR RIGHTS.

I hold that the strongest bar against disunion is the preservation of the territories from slave settlement. To explain this, some reference to the condition of those States where the multiplication of slaves has made their owners masters of the government and the soil, is necessary. Governor Hammond, a leading nullifier of South Carolina, and one of the greatest supporters of the slave interest, cannot be suspected of exaggerating the mischief it works on the non-slave-holding whites. Here is his testimony as to their condition, in an addres before the South Carolina Institute, in 1850:

"They obtain a precarious subsistence by occasional jobs, by hunting by fishing, by plundering fields or folds, and too often by what is in its effects far worse—trading with slaves, and seducing them to plunder for their benefit."

Mr. Tarver, another southern writer of distinction, sustains this statement in a paper on the subject of domestic manufactures in the South:

"The free population of the South may be divided into two classes, the slave-holder and the non-slave-holder. I am not aware that the relative numbers of these two classes have ever been ascertained in any of the States, but I am satisfied that the non-slave-holders far outnumber the slave-holders—perhaps by three to one. In the more southern portion of this region, the non-slave-holders possess, generally, but very small means, and the land which they possess is almost universally poor, and so sterile that a scanty subsistence is all that can be derived from its cultivation; and the more fertile soil, being in the possession of the slave-holder, must ever remain out of the power of those who have none."

In treating of the same project (manufacturing establishments) as a means of redeeming the white population of the South holding no slaves, and thrown out of employment by being driven from the culture of the soil by them, the Hon. J. H. Lumpkin, of Georgia, says:

"It is objected that these manufacturing establishments will become the hot-beds of crime. * * * * * But I am by no means ready to concede that our poor, degraded, half-fed, half-clothed, and ignorant population—without Sabbath schools or any other kind of instruction, mental or moral, or without any just appreciationof character—will be injured by giving them employment, which will bring them under the oversight of employers, who will inspire them with self-respect by taking an interest in their welfare."

Mr. Wm Gregg in a paper before the South Carolina Institute, handling the same subject, remarks, that "any man who is an observer of things could hardly pass through our country without being struck with the fact that all the capital, enterprise and intelligence is employed in directing slave labor; and the consequenc is, that a large portion of our poor white people are wholly neglected, and are suffered to while away an existence in a state but one step in advance of the Indian of the forest. It is an evil of vast magnitude, and nothing but a change in public sentiment will effect its cure.

TYRANNY OVER WHITE SLAVES AT THE SOUTH.

In these principal journals of the Old Dominion and of South Carolina, we have the solution of the difficulty growing out of the monopoly of

the soil by slave labor, and the sovereignty over the State Governments, which, as an incident, it conferred on the masters. The utter destitution and entire dependence of the white working classes on the slaveholding class, and the absolute independence of the latter on the former, produces a state of superiority on one side, and inferiority on the other, that does not exist anywhere among the despotisms of Europe. There the nobleman has no power to *force* any man (the serfs of Russia excepted) to work for him. He must offer a reward of some sort to the laborer to obtain his service. If one employer will not give adequate wages, the laborer may appy to another, and there is therefore some dependence of the great property holders on the good will and prefer ence for them on the part of the working class. But in the South, the great slaveholder looks to his slaves as an all-sufficient body of machinery, which enables him to dispense with the labor of the free labor class; and he may use them and supply them, or refuse them and starve them at pleasure. I invited allusion to this southern testimony as to the state of things where the slave power flourished most, during the late session of Congress. The facts were not denied by a single member from the South, nor was the argument controverted. It was not denied that the accumulation of wealth is slaves, which necessarily engrossed the soil for their owners, must put the white race of laborers wholly at their mercy.

HOW THE "POOR WHITES" ARE TO BE "PROTECTED."

The facts and inference being undisputed, the reply with the remedy for the evil they exposed is given in the passages quoted from the presses which speak for the slaveholders. What is it? We are told that "protection to the weak, and subsistence for the ignorant, improvident and vicious, are the two most obvious considerations that render domestic slavery necessary;" that "the South maintains that slavery is right, natural and necessary;" that "the laws of all the Southern States justified the holding white men in slavery;" that "the principle of slavery is in itself right, and does not depend on difference of complexion;" that "slavery, black or white, is right and necessary;" that "our negroes are not only better off as to physical comfort, than free laborers, but their moral condition is better." The salvation then for the free white laborer, falling into pauperism in the South, and struggling in vain under the superincumbent weight of the well-directed slave power, is to make him a slave, and give him the benefit of the same masters. This is clearly the whole drift of the policy, now for the first time boldly enforced by argument. The blessing which this new feature of the peculiar institution is to bring on our government, is thus illustrated in a Richmond *Examiner*:

"This agitation has produced one happy effect, at least—it has compelled us of the South to look into the nature and character of this great institution, and to correct many false impressions that even we had entertained in relation to it. Many in the South once believed that it was a moral and political evil. That folly and delusion are gone. We see it now it its true light, and regard it as the most safe and stable basis for free institutions in the world. It is impossible with us that the conflict can take place between labor and capital, which makes it so difficult to establish and maintain free institutions in all wealthy and highly civilized nations where such institutions as ours do not exist. The Southern States are an aggregate, in fact, of communities, not of individuals. Every plantation is a little community, with the master at its head, who concentrates in himself the united interests of capital and labor, of which he is the common representative. These small communities aggregated make the State in all whose action, labor and capital is equally represented and perfectly harmonized."

THE MASTERS THE EMBODIMENT OF ALL POWER IN THE SLAVE STATES.

Here is a new system divulged: "Every plantation is a little community, with the master at the head, who concentrates in himself the united interests of capital and labor." "These small communities aggregated make the State." Louis the XIV, King of France, said, "I am the State." Each "little community" composed of white and black on the large plantations of the South, has "a master at the head," and the masters of "these small communities aggregated" are the State. And to make the masters of the blacks more absolutely the masters of the State, we find that the representation in many of the Southern States is apportioned on the black basis. The counties with a great number of negroes and a few whites, have in this State a majority of the Legislature, and can control that portion of the State having a much greater number of whites and fewer slaves. Eastern Virginia, with its multitudes of slaves and few whites, has a control in the Legislature over the larger white population west of the mountains and its fewer slaves. In South Carolina the sway of the masters in the Legislature over the whites is made still more absolute; for, besides basing representatoin upon black population, the constitution makes the ownership of ten slaves a qualification for a seat in the Legislature, or an equivalent in freehold estate. And it takes away the choice of the Presidential electors altogether from the people, and gives it to this slaveholding assembly.

THE TERRITORIES WERE TO BE FREE AS AN OFFSET TO SLAVE REPRESENTATION.

This is the system which the Richmond press now urges on, to establish a principle that will justify the actual enslavement of the dependent class of the free white population. This is not my statement of the case. It is the record of the principles and policy of the democratic party in the South as delineated by the leading statesmen and presses directing its power. The record is made by them, I merely copy it. Is it the democracy of Jefferson or Jackson; or of the true Republican party, built up by the fathers of our government? I think not. Their principle was, that the white race should, by a majority of its suffrages, wield the authority of the State Governments. They allowed representation in Congress to the owners of slaves in the South for three-fifths of that species of population, in consideration that all the territories of the United States should be reserved exclusively for free labor. *The Ordinance of* 1787, *making this reservation, was before Congress at the same moment that the Constitution was under debate in the convention, and these mutual concessions, resigning the territories to free labor on one side, and granting an increased representation to slave owners on the other, constituted one of the compromises which became necessary to establish the Government of the Union.*

It was in pursuance of this principle of compromise between the North and South engrafted in the constitution, that gave Missouri and all the territory south of 36° 30' to slave settlement, and all north of it to the emigration of free settlers. This was a most solemn treaty. Its stipulations ought to be held more sacred than any other, because it has root in the policy recognized in the constitution as the basis of the Union——because it was proferred by the weaker power, and was ratified, not by the sanction of the President and Senate alone, as in the case of ordinary treaties, but by the House of Representatives, and called, in con-

tradistinction to other statutes, by universal accord, "the Missouri Compromise." The breach of this, like the breach of treaties among independent States, has brought on an appeal to force. Civil war between the free and slave States is impending, and nothing can avert it but a return to the principle of the Compromise, and of good faith. It is on this ground that the Republican party has taken its stand.

MEDITATED TREASON IN CASE OF FREMONT'S ELECTION.

The Presidential candidates of the opposing parties Mr. Fillmore who heads one ticket, and Mr. Breckinridge on the other, who speaks for Mr. Buchanan and himself, say that the election of the Republican candidate will be a signal for the dissolution of the Union. The Charleston *Mercury* proclaims that all parties in South Carolina are resolved, and Mr. Brooks, already notorious by his attack in the Senate on the person of a member and the rights of that body, has declared that Fremont's election would be followed by the seizure of the Capitol and archives of the government by a military force, and Mr. Wise, of Virginia, has written letters and given verbal assurances to countenance the design.

RESTORATION OF FREE SOIL TO FREE LABOR.

What men will rally to this standard of disunion? Will the free white men, who have no slaves, enlist to break up the government and to destroy an administration which comes into power on a principle and under the most sacred pledges to restore their violated rights? The Republican party directs its efforts to the restoration of the soil dedicated to free labor to that class of citizens, North and South, for whom its settlement was reserved, to deliver them from the encroachment and gradual monopoly which the owners of slaves always accomplish wherever the institution is admitted. The single handed freeman cannot hold his own against one who has the advantage of a multitude of hands. The result in the South settles this point. And it is to this fact Col. Fremont adverts in the strong pledge he gives to the free laborer, who has neither lands nor slaves, in this passage of his letter accepting the nomination to the Presidency. Speaking of the breach of the Missouri Compromise, he says:

"That fatal act which gave birth to this purely sectional strife originating in the scheme to take from free labor the country secured to it by a solemn covenant, cannot be too soon disarmed of its pernicious force. The only genial region of the middle latitudes, left to the emigrants of the Northern States for homes cannot be encroached from the laborers, who have long considered it as set apart for them as our inheritance, without provoking a desperate struggle. Whatever may be the persistence of the particular class which seems ready to hazard everything for the success of the unjust scheme it has partially effected. I firmly believe that the great heart of the nation, which trobs with the patriotism of the free men of both sections, will have power to overcome it. They will look to the rights secured to them by the Constitution of the Union as their best safe guard from the oppression of the class which—by a monopoly of the soil and of slave labor to till it—might in time reduce to the extremity of laboring upon the same terms with the slaves. The great body of non-slaveholding free men, including those of the South, upon whose welfare slavery is an oppression, will discover that the power of the general government over the public lands may be beneficially exerted to advance their interests and secure their independence. Knowing this, their suffrages will not be wanting to maintain that authority in the Union which is absolutely essential to the main guinance of their own liberties, and which has more than once indicated the purpose of disposing of the public lands in such a way as would make every settler upon them a freeholder."

SOUTHERN NON-SLAVEHOLDERS IN THE WAY OF THE TRAITORS.

On the election of Fremont, Governor Wise proposes to call on the people of Virginia, and Mr. Brooks on those of other States to put down the government of the Union by force. Will the great body of the South, who have neither slaves nor land, enlist to put down a President who will exert all his constitutional power to give them homesteads in the new territories reserved for their settlements by the compromise—by treaty stipulations? *A homestead bill, giving, without price, to every actual settler on the public domain a homestead of one hundred and sixty acres of land, on condition of occupancy and cultivating for a period of five years, is the measure looked to by Colonel Fremont to provide for those whom the nullifiers would make slaves.* The measure has been passed in the House of Representatives and defeated in the Senate, and was renewed again by a leading Republican members from Pennsylvania at the last session. *If Fremont is elected, it will, I have no doubt, be carried into a law. Will the laboring class in our country, having no lands, join with Messrs. Wise and Brooks in putting down the government that tenders happy homes in the public domain?*

Are the whites in the South so in love with an institution which impoverishes them and leaves them not an inch of soil they can call their own, that they would make war upon a President and a government which invited them to a rich region set apart for them and their posterity that they may escape from the oppressive power which leaves them nothing but life? If they should enlist under Messrs. Wise and Brooks to destroy the Union and establish slavery in the territories, what would they gain by it? Would the slave owners divide their slaves and their lands with them, after they had shed their blood to extend slave sway over the free territories. Or it is certain, in the slaveholders were so benevolently inclined, that they would be able to retain the slaves throughout the civil war or acquire the lands for which they fought? Who can doubt but that the mass of free men of the South would prefer acquiring happy homes in the rich West without fighting for them, and holding them under the shield of the Union, than enter upon the hopeless task of conquering them for the slaveholders, by a war on the government of the Union, supported by twenty-six millions of freemen in the North, by their wealth and by all the wealth of the world, which the credit of the national government could command.

I ask what the people of Maryland would reply to a call on them to destroy the government, and put Messrs. Wise and Brooks in possession of its remains? Would the non-slaveholders and their posterity give up for themselves and their posterity their share in the rich public domain, which they may have without price and with the blessings of the Union accompanying and securing it to them for the glory of fighting battles for nullifying gentry? Will the slaveholders of Maryland be found willing to make their State a battle-field—break up the seat of government at Washington—the commerce of Baltimore, and bring down the frontier of a foreign government to the State boundary, that the slaves may have only an ideal line to dass to be secure in their liberty? Neither the slave-owners nor non-slaveholders of Maryland will join the ranks of those who would make a spoil of their blood and treasure, to satiate the partisan thirst for vengeance, felt by such men as Wise and Brooks—or their eagerness for notoriety, power or plunder.

Whoever peruses, with a careful eye, the passage quoted from Fremont's address to his countrymen, will see where the interests of peace lie,

and the guaranty for its security. The great body of our people, who own no slaves, will see in its promises happy homes, without war, and ree from the intrusion of an institution which undermines them. They will choose whether they and their posterity will enjoy the territories of the Union, or surrender them to slavery.

THE "EQUALITY OF THE STATES."

It is pretended that the alternative thus held out, and on which the votes of the majority of free white men are to decide, is a violation of the equality of States; and on this ground the dissolution of the Union is threatened. It is pretended that if slavery is not admitted into the territories, it is a wrong done to the citizens of the South, who are precluded from taking their property with them, while the citizens of the North are not so precluded. This is not true. The citizens of the South, as well as the North, may take their property with them, [illegible] take also the peculiar laws of their [illegible]; and which converts this property into an institution, to make it available. The local laws of New York authorize every citizen to convert his capital, consisting of stocks or money, or money, into a bank, and issue paper [illegible], and lend it out at seven per cent; but no citizen of New York can carry his bank, with the privileges to use it, as given by the State laws, into Kansas. A citizen of Virginia may carry all the people over whom he has control into Kansas, but he cannot use there the power over them, he holds only in the virtue of the Virginia law. Slavery is a local institution. It is more than a domestic institution—it is a voting institution, and a monopolizing institution, absorbing sovereignty over both the State Government and the soil. It can exist no where without law. There is no law for it in the territories, and no State can send its laws with it to establish it as such. Atchison, the instrument of the nullifiers, was taught this by his employers. They knew that they could neither hold the Indians in Kansas, nor the poor whites, if they mastered them there, nor the poor negroes whom they had nurtured in slavery as slaves, in the Territory. There was no law for it. They would have been liberated at once on an appeal to the Supreme Court. The slave owners therefore would not take this property into a territory, where the institution of slavery was not established by law, and where a majority of the settlers, the legal voters, were against it. The nullifiers did not then take it into a territory, but employed the power of the institution in an adjoining State to embody a military force to invade the Territory, to drive the *bona fide* voters from the polls, and establish a legislature representing a people not in the Territory; to make laws creating the institution of slavery, which is to absorb the sovereignty of the country for the few asserting the character of masters. This usurpation was set up by Atchison, by fraud and force. And it has provided that no one can have the rights of a citizen in Kansas, especially the right of suffrage, who does not swear to support the laws of slavery proclaimed by this usurpation. President Pierce has recognised this horrible outrage upon all law, as the established authority in Kansas. If sustained, it will establish slavery there by the right of conquest. Buchanan stands pledged to sustain it, as the President has done; and the issue now before the country is, shall Buchanan be elected to confirm the conquest, which the President, who designated him as his successor, gives the sword of the Union to enforce? Can any man believe that peace will be restored, by putting in power a man who sanctions such violence?

Another pretence for dissolution of the Union urged by Mr. Brooks and his compatriots, is the assumption that the Republican party is an abolition party. This is an audacious libel. The Republican party put out its manifesto at its inauguration at Pittsburg. It abjures the idea of intermeddling with slavery where it exists, or interfering with it in any State which may hereafter establish it. It insists only on the right of Congress to legislate on the subject in the territories—a right exerted under the confederacy, recognised and established by the constitution, and effectuated by acts of Congress, from the foundation of the government to the present hour, in the formation of every Territory into an embryo State. The partisans in the Senate of that mockery of all law, squatter sovereignty, admitted the principle at the last session, in their pitiful attempt to mitigate the atrocity of Atchison's domestic laws making it felony to question slavery in Kansas.

THE CHARGE OF ABOLITIONISM REFUTED.

I was at Pittsburg—was a member of the committee which embodied in form the principles on which the Republicans of the Union installed their organization. It was designed to oppose the phalanx of nullifiers, wielding the Executive power to overthrow the most solemn compacts made between the States—to destroy the principles of the Constitution, and to found a oligarchy based on slavery in their stead. I can safely affirm that there was not one in that Convention who looked to its action as a means of abolishing slavery in the slave States. On the contrary, they looked to its action, in restoring the pacification which bound the States together, as a security to the institution in the States where it exists. Every man must now see that pacification and the preservation of the Union is its only security. It is well known that civil war, in a nation where slavery exists, liberates the slaves. The civil war of Marius and Scyila liberated the slaves in Italy. The civil war in Mexico and of the South American republics, abolished it within them. The States invaded by Bolivar offered freedom to all the slaves who would join the ranks to oppose him. Bolivar on his part proclaimed universal emancipation to recruit his ranks. History records the result.

As a member of the Republican Convention, I can say with confidence that, to the prevalent sense of that body, nothing could be more revolting than the general manumission of the slaves in the South, and putting them on a level with the white race.

The liberation of the blacks, under existing circumstances, is known to be impossible—that it would be ruinous to their owners—a great evil to all others of the white race, and fatal to the negroes, who would perish under the inteligence and energy of a superior race, as the Narragansetts, Pequods and Mohicans perished under it in another quarter. Humanity for the incapable race forbids the experiment, and justice to both classes of the superior one requires that they should be saved from the hazards of the struggles it would provoke.

How the question of slavery is, in the tract of time, to be disposed of, depends on the will of the government of the States having it in charge. Natures's code, written in the heart, will, with the progress of Christianity and civilization, work out a happy result. It may gradually go out southward, and an improved race of blacks appear as a colony of our country within the tropics of South America. Amalgamation or equality with our race in the same government is impossible.

PRACTICAL SYMPATHY FOR POOR WHITE MEN.

My neighbors know that my declarations against sweeping abolition are sincere. They know that I own slaves, some inherited and some that have begged their way into my house from the slave-pen; and while that my course in submitting to this encumbrance is characterized by humanity, they have proof in my conduct, that so far from using it to degrade my own flesh and blood in the persons of those who toil with their hands for a living, and to bring them to the condition to which the *Democracy*, speaking through the Richmond press, would assign them, that my best efforts have been to counteract this tendency of the system. My strongest sympathies are for the laboring white man. Under this feeling, and believing it the best mode of gradually superceding slavery in the cultivation of the soil, I have employed free labor for the most part in my farming and with the happiest consequences.

Of the neighbors whom I employed to assist me in opening and in the cultivation and improvement of my farm, too, who hold no land, now possess little farms and comfortable homesteads of their own in fee simple. If instead of free labor, I had purchased and employed negroes in my cultivation, I might have added from the profits. all these homesleads to my own domain and exhibited a wide-spread scene of wasting African agriculture. Now the whole neighborhood is dotted with neat and thriving farms and cottages, and the land which sold for ten, fifteen and twenty dollars an acre when I began to open my farm thirteen years ago, now sells for from sixty to one hundred and sometimes more. I do not mention this to assert my claims on my neighbors. They have done more for me than I for them. I state facts to recommend a system. The general benefit every one admits. One of the orators who came from the city to denounce me under the crown of Old Buck's horns, set up to overlook my precincts, complimented him on the great improvement of the scenc around him, but said, fixing his eye on my home, that his heart sunk within him when he reflected that it belonged to "an arch traitor," and then it was that he summoned the lightning to blast me.

SMALL FARMS ABSORBED BY GREAT PLANTATIONS.

The system of small tenements and free labor can alone confer beauty and strength on an impoverished region. Even the rich soil of Kentucky, the beautiful luxuriance of which it is almost impossible to destroy, cannot prevent the comparative weakness that awaits a State which turns away free labor, and sends it to build up rival free States in the West. Example will illustrate. I have three relatives in Kentucky, honest, benevolent, most estimable men, who, when I left the State, were farmers on a limited scale. Within twenty years one has bought up ten of the farms around him, another twelve, another fifteen, in the heart of Woodford and Fayette. Handsome edifices, once the homes of families numbering a multitude, scattered over the country, are now occupied as granaires, a small one here and there inhabited by an overseer. The population is gone, the school-houses are deserted, the churches have no congregations, and yet the country is beautiful, clothed with grass, covered with herds of the finest cattle, mules, and horses in the world. The corn fields for the support of this quadruped population in winter are worked by slaves. The rain and sunshine that makes the grass grow, provides for them in summer as it does in the pampas of the South America that creats the living wealth of those solitudes. The white population banished by this species of engrossing cultivation have a right to the territories reserved by the compact for free labor. And are not the people further south, who have no hold on the soil there also to be secure of a home somewhere? On a multitude of the great plantations in the South free labor is entirely dispensed with. They have not only their blacksmith, but their black carpenter, wheelwright, plasterer and painter; and where are all the white mechanics to go? and where are the white laborers who are already driven to the hilts to live by hunting, fishing and robbing—as Gov. Hammond, of South Carolina, tells us—where are they to go if slavery in the new territories is to pursue them with the same fate? I hope my neighbors will pardon me when I proclaim it, that my feelings and judgment alike actuate me to fight the battle for the rights of the white cultivator of the soil and the white mechanic, against all who would pursue him into the new territories with the institution which drives them out from those "little communities," at the head of which, reigns a master, who, with his fellows, the organs of democracy in the South tell us constitute the state. Your fellow-citizen, F. P. Blair.

Silver Springs, September 17.

LETTER FROM JUDGE EPHRAIM MARSH.

Gentlemen: Having been constrained by the course of public events, occurring since the meeting of the American National Convention by which Hon. Millard Fillmore was nominated for President of the United States, over which convention I had the honor to preside, to renounce that nomination, you, as my colleagues in that convention, are entitled to my reasons for so doing, and I proceed, briefly but frankly, to state them.

It was known to my friends at Philadelphia, that the Pro-Slavery platform there adopted, and which drove so many Northern delegates from the convention, was repugnant to my sentiments and sympathies. But confiding in the sympathies of Mr. Fillmore, who, in the Legislature of New York and in Congress, had ever acted with the friends of freedom, I acquiesced in an exceptionable platform. In view of the perfidious repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the aggressions and outrages perpetrated by Missourians upon Kansas, with more than the approval of the General Government, I looked for some expression of the sentiments which pervaded the whole North—sentiments that Mr. Fillmore had ever professed—in his letter of acceptance. But in this expectation I was disappointed. There was a studied and significant avoidance in that letter, of the question upon which he knew, as we all know, the Presidential election is to be decided, either in favor of or against slavery-extension. Nor was I less disappointed in finding the friends of Mr. Fillmore in Congress voting steadily, throughout a protracted session, with the supporters of aggression and outrage in Kansas, and persisting in such votes after, by the report of the Kansas Congressional Committee, it had irrefragably proven that the elections in Kansas had been carried by armed bodies of men from Missouri; that an infamous code of Territorial Laws had been enacted in Kansas by Missourians; that free presses in Kansas had been destroyed by Missourians; that settlers in Kansas had been robbed and murdered by the Missourians; that organized and armed bodies of men from Missouri and other slave States had sworn, in secret societies, that Kansas shall become a slave State; and finally, that all these outrage

were perpetrated with the aid and approbation of a United States Judge and Marshal, and in the presence of the United States troops. But these great wrongs, though arousing the just indignation of freemen, have elicited no word of reproof from Mr. Fillmore. On the contrary, in his speech at Albany, he astounded the country in declaring that the election of Col. Fremont, by the spontaneous suffrages of a majority of the Republic, would occasion a dissolution of the Union. And up to the last vote in the called session of Congress, when the friends of freedom endeavored, in the army appropriation bill, to protect the citizens of Kansas by the adoption of a conservative proviso, Hon. Mr. Haven, the confidential partner of and partisan of Mr. Fillmore, voted with the pro slavery majority. Indeed, since the commencement of the just closed session of Congress, slavery has not obtained an advantage that it did not owe to the votes of Mr. Fillmore's friends: nor has freedom encountered a defeat that did not come from the same quarter of the House of Representatives. His friends, holding the balance of power, turned the scale, when it would turn in favor of slavery.

And where, or in what respect, has Mr. Fillmore profited, politically, by all these sacrifices of principle?—all these violations of duty—all these surrenders of independence—all this self-abasement? What has been gained by bartering FREEDOM for SLAVERY?

His nomination, as you know, was demanded by our Southern brethren, who would only consent, even to his nomination, upon terms that drove most of the Northern delegates out of the Convention. It was painfully apparent, in the deliberations of our Convention, that Americanism was but a secondary object. Slavery was with them the paramount consideration. While, for the sake of the broad American principles that had taken deep hold of the public mind, *we* were prepared to ignore the slavery question, *they* insisted upon making it, and did make it, the primary article of faith in our platform.

And how, after imposing terms which have shorn the American party of its Northern strength, do the South Americans act? Have they kept or broken faith with us? In North Carolina, whose election is just over, the American party is virtually disbanded. Hon. Mr. Puryear, an American member of Congress from that State, concedes the State to Mr. Buchanan, though, aside from slavery, there is an acknowledged majority against him.

In Kentucky, where was one year ago a triumphant American majority, our party is beaten, if not annihilated. Col. Humphrey Marshall, a gallant leader, seems to have nailed *his* colors to the mass, but that only proves that *he* is faithful among the faithless."

The Hon. Mr. Walker, of Alabama, a member of our Convention, who was among the most zealous advocates of Mr. Fillmore's nomination, has, from his seat in Congress, proclaimed his abandonment of Mr. Fillmore, and his adhesion to Mr. Buchanan. Senator Jones of Tennessee, with Senators Pratt and Pearce, of Maryland, life-long opponents of the Democratic party, have proclaimed themselves in favor of Mr. Buchanan, and now stand along with Senators Cass, Douglas, Atchison, &c., upon the Cincinnati platform. *There has been, within the last three months, and since the issue which is to give freedom to, or force slavery into Kansas, was made up, a regular political stampede from the Southern Whig and American parties over to the support of Mr. Buchanan.*

Now what, let me inquire, does all this mean? Mr. Fillmore, as you well know, was the nominee of Southern States. Those delegates were not only for him, but would take none else. Why, then, do they abandon him? Simply because they, having but one interest in politics, and watchfully consulting the political barometer, are guided by its suggestions. They calculate the chances and the cost of a Presidential election. The platform upon which they placed Mr. Fillmore offended Northern sentiment. The action in Congress and the events in Kansas have awakened throughout the North and West an indignation so deep and pervading as to deprive Mr. Fillmore of the votes of every free State. To qualify himself for acceptance in slave States, Mr. Fillmore had to take ground which necessarily repelled the free States; and having thus lost the North, the South, for that reason, abandons him. In this the South acts understandingly, and is true to herself. Mr. Fillmore became valueless to slavery the moment it was certain that he could not subsidize the North. And although abandoned by those who nominated him, neither Mr. Fillmore nor his friends can justly charge the South with bad faith, for the terms of the compact were distinctly understood. They aimed, with Americanism as a cover, to extend slavery. He was to bring Northern strength. Unable from the stringency of the terms imposed, and the enormity of the outrages perpetrated in Kansas to do that, the consideration failed, and the South declares for Buchanan instead of Fillmore, as the most available candidate. If, therefore, the South, as it has done whenever a "Northern man with Southern principles" ceases to be useful, lets Mr. Fillmore "slide," he must console himself, as did Cardinal Wolsey, with the reflection that, if he "had served Freedom with half the zeal he has given to slavery, he would not now be left naked to his enemies." Nor is this poetic truth only, for while serving freedom no man was more honored and prospered than Millard Fillmore; rising, as he did, from station to station, higher and higher and higher in the State and National Governments, and enjoying, until tempted by ambition to abandon his principles and party, universal regard and confidence.

Shall we of the North, then, be required to adhere to a nomination which has been deliberately abandoned by the South? Shall we cling to Mr. Fillmore after those most earnest for his nomination are supporting Mr. Buchanan?

This is the practical question. Let us, therefore, look it practically in the face:

Even in the present state of the canvass, all but one or two of the Southern States are not only sure to vote for Mr. Buchanan, but are made sure by the votes of the Southern Americans who were pledged to Mr. Fillmore. As the canvass progresses, and Northern sentiment develops and concentrates in favor of Col. Fremont, the remaining one or two Southern States will declare unmistakably for Mr. Buchanan, on whom the South will be united.

On the other hand, the Free States with the exception of New Jersy and Pennsylvania, have or in the progress of the canvass will, declare for Fremont.

The nominees of the American party, abandoned by the South, though espousing its principles, and repudiated by the North *because* of its subserving to the South, is driven into New Jersey and Pennsylvania, two States upon which his friends hang a "forlorn hope." But does Mr. Fillmore, or any sane man, suppose or pre-

tend that he can carry either of these States! Assuredly not.

It is certain, however, and it is conceded, that a union of the Americans and Republicans, in both States, would take them from Buchanan and carry them where they belong, into brother hood and fraternity with Freedom.

May I not, then, relying upon the patriotism of my American friends, appeal to them with confidence in favor of Union here in my own State, and in our sister State of Pennsylvania, for the sake of that glorious Union which we all love and cherish as an inheritance more precious than any other gift, though incumbered, as portions of it necessarily were, with Slavery? Does any one tell me in reply that our American principles forbid this union? Of such, let me inquire what has been done, or ought to be done, by Southern Americans in Congress, to carry out our principles? Have they [illegible] any [illegible]? Or have not their votes [illegible] given constantly in favor of [illegible]? In refusing to unite with other friends [illegible] Kansas, (the only issue involved in the contest,) Americans in New Jersey and Pennsylvania are with their eyes open to the inevitable result, aiding Mr. Buchanan, whose National and State platforms contain open denunciations of the American party, to carry these States. Yes, nothing is more certain than that New Jersey and Pennsylvania can elect or defeat Mr. Buchanan. The responsibility either way rests with Americans. We can beat or be beaten by the party that is avowedly hostile to Freedom and to Americanism. We cannot elect Mr. Fillmore, and for one, after the course pursued in Congress by his immediate representatives; after his own disloyal declarations in favor of a dissolution of the Union in the event of Col. Fremont's election, I am free to say I do not desire his success.

I have heard but two tangible reasons urged against Col. Fremont. The first is that he is a sectional candidate. This is neither his fault, or the fault of those who support him. The repeal of the Missouri Compromise was a national question and a national wrong.

The extension of slavery beyond its constitutional boundary is a national question. If, as in the repeal of that compromise, national compacts were violated, may not the people seek national redress? In what way, or by what means, can that wrong be righted but in a constitutional manner, through the ballot boxes? The freedom of Kansas and Nebraska was violated by the action of the executive and legislative departments of the Government. May we not, without incurring the reproach of sectionalism, endeavor to re-establish Freedom in those Territories, by reforming the executive and legislative departments?

The other objection to Mr. Fremont addresses itself particularly to Americans. It is alleged that he is a Roman Catholic. The force of this objection depends upon its truth or falsity. It is a simple question of fact. The charge originated in the New York *Express*, and rested upon the declaration of Alderman Fulmer, who says that when at Brown's Hotel, in Washington, in the winter of 1853, he saw Col. Fremont worshipping in a Catholic church; that he conversed with the Colonel on the subject of religion; and that he defended the extreme doctrines of the Romish Church. By reference to the columns of the same *Express*, it is shown that Col. Fremont was, during the whole of the time Alderman Fulmer locates him at Washington, on board of ocean steamers. An examination of the register and cash books of Brown's Hotel, show that Col. Fremont was not, during the years of 1852 and 1853, at that hotel. Here is conclusive, independent evidence, that Alderman Fulmer is mistaken. This testimony is confirmed by Col. Fremont's denial of the whole story. The archives of the Episcopal church at Washington show that Col. Fremont's children had Protestent babtism. Mr. Livingston, who was Col. Fremont's companion across the Rocky Mountains, says that he carried with them a pocket Protestant Bible. He presented his wife with a Protestant prayer book before their marriage.

His preceptor says that he received a Protestant education. Col. Fremont says to everybody that inquires of him, that he is and has ever been a Protestant. And yet, not only in the absence of all testimony, but after every allegation has been disproved, those who fabrica[illegible] the falsehood, and I am [illegible] to [illegible] that [illegible] many intelligent, honest [illegible], who would require better evidence to [illegible] dog caught with the wool in his mouth [illegible] sheep, believe that Col. F. is a Papist.

It was said, you will remember, by many of our friends at Philadelphia, that Mr. Fillmore's name would be used at the South merely to divide the friends of freedom at the North. I did not believe it then, nor do I know that such was their design, but that Mr. Fillmore's name is *now* only used for that purpose is transparently certain. Nor should this surprise us, for it is just what the past has often revealed.

Mr. Van Buren, who for thirty years was devoted to the South, hesitated about the admission of Texas, and was thrown overboard.

Gen. Pierce, literally used up in promoting the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and in sustaining border-ruffianism, was remorselessly sacrificed at Cincinnati by the South for "an older, if not better" doughface, whom they hope to elect. Differ as they may and do in relation to all other questions, on this, every extreme of shade and sentiment and opinion unite. They regard the Bank—the Tariff—the Public Domain, &c., &c., subordinate questions, and differ upon them; but in voting upon the annexation of Texas—the admission of California free—the Fugitive Slave law—the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, &c., &c., they always unite; or if a Southern member gives a wrong vote, like Cullum of Tennessee, and Hunt of Louisiana, they are shot down. Why, then, should they not, as they have, make their Americanism subservient to their slavery? If, therefore, Mr. Buchanan should be elected, I see no end to the encroachments and usurpations of the Slave Power—and hence I shall neither vote for him, nor throw my vote away. In a contest which is to determine whether Slavery or Freedom is to be the governing principle of this Republic, I choose to cast my vote where it will tell for Freedom. These considerations lead me to the support of the Republican nominees for President and Vice President, not because I am less an American than when our National Convention assembled, but because those by whom Mr. Fillmore was nominated, from Southern States, have abandoned him for a candidate openly and avowedly arrayed against the American party, thus sacrificing for slavery both their candidate and their Americanism: and because, furthermore, by voting for Mr. Fillmore, while the contest is between Buchanan and Fremont, I should indirectly aid the former, whose principles, as an anti-American and slavery-extensionist, are obnoxious to all my convictions of duty.

EPHRAIM MARSH.